

Death to Neologisms: Domestication in the English Retranslations of Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig*

Marlies Gabriele Prinzl, University College London

Keywords:

Death in Venice, Thomas Mann, neologisms, linguistic creativity, retranslation, corpus-based, methodology

Abstract: Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig* (1912) owes much of its fame in English to a translation from 1928 by Helen Tracy Lowe-Porter. The novella however has in fact been translated many times – first by Burke (1924, with a revised edition following in 1970), and, after Lowe-Porter, by Luke (1988), Koelb (1994), Appelbaum (1995), Neugroschel (1998), Chase (1999), Heim (2004), Doege (2007) and Hansen & Hansen (2012). Most of these versions are neither known to readers nor discussed in academic literature. This paper, which comes as part of a larger study on linguistic creativity in *Der Tod in Venedig*, focuses on the use of neologisms by Mann and what happens to them in (re)translation. Relying on a digital corpus composed of the complete set of English retranslations and a corpus-based methodology, the paper argues that, despite the extended time period between the publications and different translation conditions, neologisms are treated uniformly by the translators. Mann's coinages are nearly always obliterated through normalisation and, if preserved, demonstrate less creativity overall than in the ST, raising questions about the Retranslation Hypothesis (RH) which proposes that early TT versions tend to domesticate while later ones increasingly foreignise.

1. Introduction

When Thomas Mann was writing *Der Tod in Venedig* (*Death in Venice*), he was, for various reasons, uncertain of its success and, after a first publication in two installments in the literary magazine *Die Neue Rundschau* (1912), initially only planned a limited print-run as part of Hans von Weber's Hyperionverlag Hundertdrucke. More than a century later, *Der Tod in Venedig* is one of Mann's most widely read works and has been translated into more than twenty-three languages. Its translation history in English is particularly interesting as it spans more than ten decades and eleven versions that include a revision, American and British editions and even a fan translation that was self-published online. The first translation, by Kenneth Burke, appeared in 1924 and was revised in 1970. It was soon followed by Helen Tracy Lowe-Porter's now infamous version in 1928, commissioned as part of an exclusive agreement between Fischer and Knopf, Mann's German and English publishers. Further versions came much later, a critical translation by David Luke in 1988 setting off a new surge of English *Venices*: Clayton Koelb (1994), Stanley Appelbaum (1995), Joachim

Neugroschel (1998), Jefferson Chase (1999), Michael Henry Heim (2004), Martin Doege (2007) and Thomas S. Hansen & Abby Hansen (2012).

The texts in the *Venice* retranslation corpus – which, with the exception of Lowe-Porter, have remained largely unexplored in academic research – were produced at different times and under sometimes rather different conditions, and diverge in many aspects. However, the translators' approach to neologisms is remarkably similar: they all but disappear in English. This article, which comes as part of a larger study on linguistic creativity in the novella's retranslations, explores Mann's use of neologisms in *Der Tod in Venedig* and what happens to them in (re)translation. It argues that with regard to ST neologisms all English translations of Mann's novella subscribe to an overwhelmingly domesticating approach, either removing them entirely or, if preserving them, often rendering them in a manner that displays less linguistic creativity than in the ST, demonstrating a uniformity that challenges the so-called Retranslation Hypothesis.

2. Retranslation and the retranslation hypothesis

As a study that includes all the English translations of a single work, this project falls under the phenomenon of *retranslation*, which describes “the act of translating a work that has previously been translated into the same language, or the result of such an act, i.e. the retranslated text itself” (Gürçağlar 2009: 233). While literary retranslation is common and, with certain text genres such as plays, even a prevalent phenomenon, research into the subject is relatively recent and still quite limited, especially when involving complete sets of target texts rather than only singular retranslations. Early research in the 1990s viewed literary retranslation as something positive, starting with Paul Bensimon (1990) and Antoine Berman (1990) who both proposed, in separate pieces in the same volume of the journal *Palimpsestes*, specific ideas that were later referred to as the *Retranslation Hypothesis (RH)*. Bensimon sees distinct differences between first and later retranslations, while Berman (1990, as referenced by Gürçağlar 2009: 233) describes translating as “an ‘incomplete’ act” that “can only strive for completion through retranslation as each subsequent version not only increases the number of interpretations of the ST but gets closer to it. This idea of a “unidirectional move towards ‘better’ target texts” (Gürçağlar 2009: 233) was criticised a decade later, with multiple studies (Pym 1988; Chesterman 2000; Koskinen and Paloposki 2003; Paloposki & Koskinen 2004; Susam-Sarajeva 2003 and 2006; Milton & Torres 2003; Brisset 2004; Brownlie 2006; Deane 2011; Deane-Cox 2014) arguing that retranslation is a much more complex phenomenon and that “historical context, norms, ideology, the translator's agency and intertextuality” (Gürçağlar 2009: 233) must all be considered. These studies challenge the traditional views about retranslation, including the assumption that early translations are always domesticating, while later ones increasingly foreignise; that translations always age; that the need for

retranslation is directly driven by the passage of time and that a single factor can account for the decision to retranslate.¹

As this study focuses only on a single, specific feature (neologisms) in Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig*, it is not intended as a thorough examination of the Retranslation Hypothesis but offers data from one set of retranslations extending over almost ninety years that raises questions about the view that early and later versions differ in their translational approach in terms of domestication versus foreignisation. Similarly, although some of the discussed domestication strategies (in particular normalisation and explicitation) have been proposed as translation universals,² the study does not position itself within this framework. Rather, it analyses the choices made by individual translators and within a specific case study only without considering whether these might possibly be typical and source language/target language- independent tendencies in translation.

3. Neologisms in the *Tod in Venedig* Corpus (TIVC)

3.1 Defining neologisms

The question that must be addressed first is *What are neologisms?* The answer is not straightforward. In simplest terms, neologisms are linguistic items that have been newly created by a language user. They have not been adopted into common language usage and occur infrequently. They may appear in a text only a single time, a phenomenon sometimes known as “hapax legomenon”, but may also be used by individuals other than the item's original creator. Such utilisation is, by necessity, restricted in terms of quantity of usages and users employing the item in discourse. Neologisms contain an element of *newness* either in form, meaning or function. The first may be more prevalent and can manifest itself in manifold ways. It may involve making a word from scratch by assembling characters of a language in an unfamiliar manner but more often may rely on taking existing lexical items, either in part (morphemes) or whole (complete words), and combining them with other lexical components in a novel fashion to create a coinage. Newness however can also establish itself through meaning. In such neologisms an already existing lexical item is appropriated and given a completely new or an additional meaning distinct from any others attached to the word. Unlike neologisms by form, which language users are able to notice at a glance, these kinds of coinages may be overlooked easily as they are likely to establish themselves only over time, i.e. through an item's original meaning potentials transforming gradually or a new meaning developing through a word's usage in different contexts. Meanwhile, with neologisms in function, an existing item undergoes, either gradually or spontaneously, a grammatical change, transforming from one lexical category into another, for

¹ See Brownlie (2006) and Deane-Cox (2014) for a detailed discussion of the retranslation hypothesis and its critics.

² For translation universals see Baker (1996) but also Toury (1995, for Laws of Standardization).

example, from a noun into a verb.³ The meaning of such coinages will normally be closely linked to the source item and, in most instances, the original and the new word will co-exist. They can however be easily distinguished on the basis of their immediate textual context (i.e. the clause or sentence they are used in) as well as word-class specific inflections, which will reveal their grammatical function.

The neologisms considered in this study are primarily those manifesting newness in form. Neologisms in meaning, meanwhile, were not considered suitable as they evolve in a different manner that makes them more challenging to identify immediately, certainly within a single source text and on the basis of a methodology relying in part on a wordlist (see *Methodology* Section 4). Meanwhile, items that feature newness in function can be identified more readily than neologisms in meaning, as inflections specific to a word's grammatical category are often involved in such cases. Textual context may however still be required, which an alphabetically sorted word list does not provide. Furthermore, there is the question whether newness in function is sufficient for an item to qualify as a neologism, given the much closer connection to existing words in comparison in particular to neologisms by form but arguably also neologisms by meaning. The issue that arises here is one of the degree of novelty and is linked to productivity, a feature explored in more detail in the next Section 3.1.2 In this study newness in function was generally not deemed a sufficient criterion by itself for an item to qualify as a neologism, and such words were only included on occasion, i.e. when additional factors were present to justify the inclusion, such as a fixed phrase undergoing a grammatical change or an item exhibiting newness not only in function but also on another level. Such neologisms in functions were thus anomalies and judged as they occurred.

Processes of word formation are language-specific. Although many are common across languages, some ways of word formation are conventional only in particular languages. In a study concerned with linguistic creativity, this distinction between conventional and atypical word formation processes is important, as speakers may use the latter precisely to be creative. Conventional word formation processes however may also result in linguistic creativity. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache* (Konitzer 1999) lists six main – i.e. widely used – processes of word formation in German: *Zusammensetzung* (compounding), *Zusammenbildung* (*synthetic compounding*), *Ableitung* (derivation), *Umbildung* (conversion), *Kürzung* (abbreviation) and *Terminologisierung* (terminologisation), with compounding, derivation and conversion being of relevance here.⁴

³ The creation of neologisms, whether in form, meaning or function, virtually always involves content words. Content words (also sometimes known as lexical words), which include adjectives, adverbs, nouns, verbs and interjections, are characterised as open word classes, allowing for additions. Function words, such as conjunctions, prepositions and pronouns, meanwhile belong to a closed word class, which contains fewer lexical items and rarely sees expansion.

⁴ There is no space in this article to go into detail about the different word formation processes. For a description and examples see the chapter on word formation in Konitzer's *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache* ("Die Wortbildung", 341–374).

3.2 Determining neologisms: Productivity, origin, level of innovation

While word formation processes create new words, these are not always neologisms as defined here. The decisive factor is whether the manner in which a word is formed is productive or not, and, if so, in what manner and degree. In the Hentschel grammar *Deutsche Grammatik* (2010: 282), productivity, which is language-specific, is defined as “ein Wortbildungsmuster, wenn es noch aktiv ist und neue Wörter danach gebildet werden können”. Two words are key here: *Muster* (pattern) and *aktiv* (active). Productive word formation means that a pattern must be present. While ‘pattern’ can theoretically refer to top-level word formation categories (i.e. compounding, conversion, et cetera), it can also describe a specific recurring process within these larger groupings, e.g. adjective-to-noun derivation through the addition of the suffix *-heit* (*schön – Schönheit, dunkel – Dunkelheit*). A pattern by itself, however, is not sufficient to speak of productivity: the pattern must also be in use, that is, it must be *active*. Productivity is not a permanent quality: word formation patterns can, over time, fall out of usage, something which language users who wish to be creative may take advantage of.

Active is also a relative term, as some word formation patterns are wide-spread and may, particularly in spoken language, lead to new words being coined impromptu every single day, while others may be comparatively rare. When word formation patterns are shared across languages, they are often more productive in one language than in another, meaning that items formed by the same process may go unnoticed in one instance but will be considered creative coinages in the other. A good example here is the practice of conversion, which is used both in German and English (as well as other languages) but is highly productive in German, in particular in the form of nominalisation, with the pattern being common in all kinds of linguistic contexts, from oral speech to newspaper articles to poetry. Words formed by conversion in German are thus often not considered creative, while in English they are perhaps more likely to be so.

Productivity is not an absolute factor. It constitutes a useful criterion in the consideration of creativity and for determining whether something is a neologism or not. The absence of productivity, however, does not necessarily signify creativity since a word, at least theoretically speaking, may have a completely unique formation but may have been adopted into common language usage. Similarly, even the most productive processes do not mean an automatic exclusion, as exceptions are always possible, for example, when a fixed phrase undergoes a conversion, or, as happens frequently, when a neologism is the result of not one but several word formation processes in combination. In such instances native speaker intuition is crucial in deciding whether an item qualifies as a creative coinage or not. What matters thus is not just the degree of productivity present, but the exact context for each item concerned.

Furthermore, it may be helpful to consider a word’s origin and history of usage, as these may give insight into whether it is a neologism or not. Etymological and diachronic research is not always straightforward. While the term neologism

refers to something that has been newly coined and thus suggests a specific creator, it is more often than not difficult to attribute a coinage to the individual that first made and used it, as well as the context in which it first appeared, in written but particularly so in oral discourse, which for a long time did not leave any record. It may be possible to approximate the time period in which a lexical item first appeared, but determining the exact moment of genesis and the historical trajectory of a word would require detailed study without any guarantee that a word's origin will eventually be established.⁵ Moreover, definite attribution is complicated by the fact that neologisms may have been used by different individuals in different instances at roughly the same time. However, as long as we accept that, with the exception of impromptu coinages, a neologism is not necessarily a word that is one hundred percent new, nor created and used by only one and the same single individual, this need not be disconcerting. Neologisms may indeed have some spread, although the frequency and range of usage have to be limited as they cannot be words that are clearly on the way of being adopted into a language.⁶ They must also be carefully distinguished from items that are used infrequently for other reasons – e.g. specialist terms from specific fields, advanced level synonyms of core or general usage vocabulary or old-fashioned items that are slowly receding – as these, unlike neologisms, have been adopted into the language, even if they are not used every day or not known by most speakers. A word's status, whether as a neologism or as a lexicalised item, is therefore not permanent: coinages may spread and become part of the general language over time, or they may only be used a handful of times by their creator, only to then disappear completely. Equally, long-established and once popular words can fall out of usage, something that is important to remember in a study involving a source text published more than one century ago and translations spanning as far back as 1925.

Finally, it needs to be noted that words differ in their individual level of innovation: although we may classify two items as neologisms, one may be more novel than the other, e.g. Lewis Carroll's nonce words *brillig*, *toves*, *outgrabe* are more striking coinages than a relatively self-explanatory compound like Mann's *Einzelinspiration*.⁷ This applies even if their creation follows the same general word formation pattern or when items may seem near-identical on the surface.

In order to classify a lexical item as a neologism, thus multiple criteria are applied: the type of newness (form, meaning, function, or a combination of these) which the word exhibits has to be established, the word's productivity in its formation and its individual level of innovation have to be considered, as well

⁵ This is, of course, what etymological or other, specialised dictionaries with historical components do, but the words they list are not neologisms but items that have been adopted into the language and left a lengthy trail – although their exact origin may be indeterminate as well.

⁶ Making such a judgment cannot be easy and will, on some level, also always be subjective.

⁷ Nonce words are ad-hoc coinages, created and used for that particular occasion. In contrast to neologisms like *Einzelinspiration*, which other users may coin without ever having read Mann's novella, they are unlikely to reoccur.

as its origin (if identifiable) and its (relative) spread and frequency of usage, all of which must be judged on a case-by-case basis.

4. Corpus and methodology

4.1 *Tod in Venedig* Corpus (TIVC): ST versions and TTs

The study uses an entirely digital translational corpus, containing two subcorpora: a ST corpus with two texts and a TT corpus with eleven texts. The former includes two of three different versions of *Der Tod in Venedig*, namely the so-called *Hundertdruck* (HD, published by Hyperionverlag München in 1913) and the *Buchausgabe* (BA, published by S. Fischer also in 1913),⁸ while the latter consists of all currently available translations, including Burke's original and revised versions. Both the BA and the HD are part of the corpus, as one translation (Doege's) uses the latter as its source. The specific TT editions are given in the bibliography.⁹ In most instances paper copies – often obtained second-hand as many translations are no longer in print – were used, meaning that digitisation (through scanning) and conversion into machine-readable files with Optical Character Recognition (OCR) software was necessary. Basic tagging was added to files for paragraphs, orthographic markings (italicisation) and foreign language words as well as metadata including (as applicable) text name, author, translator, year of translation, language and/or regional variety (German, British or American English), and source text. Any paratextual material – usually footnotes and, in the case of e-book versions, also hyperlinked annotations – was removed.

The corpus itself exists in two main forms: as WST-TIVC, a digital corpus created with Mike Scott's widely used linguistics software suite Word Smith Tools, and as A-TIVC, an aligned corpus in MS Word.¹⁰

4.2 Methodology for determining neologisms

Neologisms were determined through a three-fold method: to begin with, intuitive judgment was used to draw up an initial list (L1) of potential coinages, which were then subjected to a first, more objective cross-check through corpus resources, with remaining items (L2) being checked more extensively a second time with corpus resources, resulting in a final list (L3).

⁸ In addition to *Hundertdruck* and the *Buchausgabe*, there is also the *Erstdruck* (ED), the original version of *Der Tod in Venedig*, which was published over two volumes of the German literary magazine *Die Neue Rundschau* in October and November 1912. The ED is not included in the corpus as no translation is based on it.

⁹ The specific editions were used for no reason other than availability.

¹⁰ WST includes options for aligning both at sentence and paragraph level but was unable to handle a retranslation corpus of thirteen texts, necessitating the creation of a separate corpus, A-TIVC, in MS Word.

4.2.1 Intuitive judgment (L1)

The starting point for the initial list of neologisms was a ST wordlist drawn up with WST tools. On the basis of native speaker intuition (i.e. the author's) neologisms were identified and placed on a tentative list (L1), with a general approach of inclusiveness guiding this pre-selection, i.e. all items that appeared like potential coinages were included. This original list contained 253 items, which required further confirmation both due to intuition being a subjective and thus potentially problematic criterion for identification as well as the expectation that the all-inclusive approach would result in at least some incorrectly identified items.

4.2.2 Corpus-based cross-check (L2 and L3)

Further confirmation was done through a double cross-check of each L1 item through several independent corpus resources of different types and compositions. This second and third check¹¹ provided an alternative to the essentially subjective use of intuition of a single individual (i.e. the researcher), although it has to be noted that corpus resources are not entirely free of subjectivity either: they are merely more objective.

The range of resources included 1) dictionaries, both of the monolingual and bilingual kind, 2) an encyclopaedia, 3) general corpora and 4) web search engines, containing both contemporary but in some cases also historical reference data. A detailed description follows in Section 4.2.3. The resource types were included for distinct reasons, with each type providing an indication about the status and usage (or lack thereof) of words in a language. With words being created and adopted into a language in different ways, the use of a combination of resource types was considered most suitable for determining which list items were neologisms and which not. The cross-check of items was resource-specific, as the resources serve distinct purposes. Dictionaries, for example, will generally have a single entry for each item and provide information on its meaning potential(s) and, usually, a few usage examples. Additionally, synonyms and antonyms may be given. Corpora, meanwhile, contain collections of spoken or written texts that are extensive both in overall quantity and individual size, so that usage patterns of queried items may be revealed. These distinctive purposes mean that with some resources (i.e. dictionaries and encyclopaedia) it is primarily the occurrence of an item that matters when determining an item's neologism status, while with others (corpora, web search engines) the quantity of occurrences is most important. However, as all resources used are digital, quantity of occurrence in fact constituted an additional measurement applicable for the dictionaries and the encyclopaedia consulted, as, unlike with traditional print resources, not only entries but also usages are retrieved. To illustrate: with many electronic resources, including all the ones used in this study, a query for a particular lexical item (e.g. 'house') will retrieve hits which are *entries*, with entries being the specific, individual listing

¹¹ The third cross-check focused on more problematic L2 items and also drew on additional resources, such as etymological dictionaries, where needed. See also Footnote 13.

for the item, but also its *usages*, i.e. all the instances the item appears within entries. Depending on the makeup of the specific resource, usages may furthermore include appearances within the acknowledgments, preface, appendix, et cetera.¹²

More details on the significance of occurrence versus quantity of occurrences are provided in the overview of cross-check resources.

4.2.3 Resources for cross-check

Dictionaries

Four dictionaries were consulted for the cross-check: *Duden*, *OWID*, *Pons* and *Leo*, with the first two being a monolingual and the latter two bilingual (English-German) resources.¹³ All these dictionaries are large in size and include keywords from a wide range of texts. The *Duden*, which has been published since 1880, is the leading dictionary for the German language. Its most recent print edition (2013) contains 135,000 keywords while the online version (<<http://www.duden.de>>) has more than two million word forms.¹⁴ *OWID* (Online-Wortschatz-Informationssystem Deutsch, <<http://www.owid.de>>) is managed by the German language research institute IDS (Institut für Deutsche Sprache) and contains 300,000 keywords in its main component, *elexico*.¹⁵ *Pons* (<<http://www.pons.de>>), maintained by a German publisher of the same name that is specialised in dictionaries and language learning materials, amounts to at least 120,000 keywords. *Leo* (<<http://dict.leo.org>>), which was originally established in 1995 by members of the computer science department of the Technische Universität München as a resource for German-English translation and is now owned by an independent company (Leo GmbH), stood at 795,020 keywords (December 2014), with new ones being added on a continuous basis. Although the *Duden* and *Pons* also exist in print form, the web-based resources were used in all instances.

Traditionally, dictionaries list lexical items in the base form specific to each item's word category (e.g. verbs as infinitives, nouns in singular and, for German, in nominative case) and are then sorted alphabetically. With the primary function of dictionaries being to serve as a reference guide for the

¹² Although digital dictionaries are not designed for linguistic analysis in the same way as corpora are (i.e. they provide only the total number of hits and a link to where each hit occurs but typically no other statistical information), digital dictionaries are in this sense like a corpus.

¹³ In some cases it was necessary to consult additional dictionaries with more etymological information. The *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm* (published between 1852 and 1960, available online from the Universität Trier) and the *OED Online* (online version of the Oxford English Dictionary) were used in these instances.

¹⁴ The exact composition and size of the online *Duden* are not available, neither on website nor by request.

¹⁵ *OWID* has other, specialised sub-sections, e.g. for fixed expressions, which were of limited relevance for the cross-check and thus not consulted.

meaning potential of lexical items, each item is normally listed only once.¹⁶ As already indicated, this characteristic also means that what matters in terms of neologisms, is whether a word appears in a dictionary, not the quantity of occurrences – in contrast to some of the other resources used for the cross-check. Any item that is listed in a dictionary is unlikely to be a new coinage, as inclusion normally indicates that some level of lexicalisation or even conventionalisation of the term has taken place, i.e. that the item has been adopted into wider language usage beyond that of its creator or original text. This characteristic applies for both entries as well as usages, which provide further clues about a word's usage (i.e. whether it is a core word of the language, a specialised term or an obsolete item). Items that have both entries and usages, particularly if these are high in number, are clearly not neologisms – indeed, exceptions to this observation are highly unlikely.

If occurrence corroborates that a lexical item has been adopted into the language more permanently, then non-occurrence must be indicative of neologism. While this non-occurrence is indeed an important criterion, it however does not automatically make a lexical item a neologism. No dictionary contains all the words of a language, for various reasons: there are restrictions in size (the number of items that can be included, particularly in print editions, is limited) but also in content, as dictionaries may have a specialised focus or may exclude items that are specific to a region (British vs. American English), a field (medicine, mathematics, literature), a usage group (youth jargon) or whether a word is primarily used in written or spoken contexts. Language is also dynamic and evolves continually. While some lexical items become obsolete over time and are eventually removed from newer editions, new lexical items will also be created, and may undergo lexicalisation until, if successful, they are added to a language's vocabulary. This process that may last anything from a few months or years (usually for content words) to decades or even centuries (function words). In other words, non-occurrence merely indicates a lexical item's potential of being a neologism.

In the cross-check the factor of non-occurrence due to omission guided the choice of dictionaries and motivated the decision to use several rather than one dictionary as well as to consult dictionaries with a large number of keywords. With the ST not belonging to a field with a specialised terminology, general dictionaries containing words from a wide context were deemed more appropriate than specialised ones. Additional factors determining the selection were online availability and free access to each dictionary used.

Encyclopaedias

Encyclopaedias are not typically intended as a linguistic resource but provide factual information about a wide range of subjects rather than ordinary lexical items. While there is likely to be some overlap between encyclopaedias and

¹⁶ The listing format also depends on the dictionary design, as some publishers may separate lexical items that have the same form but carry distinct meanings (homonyms) or have a different grammatical function (e.g. *walk* as noun or a verb) into distinct entries.

dictionaries in the items included, with the former specialist terms are more prevalent. However, these conventions are changing with online encyclopaedias. With virtually no limitations in size and the possibility to expand and update entries continually, web-based encyclopaedias have significantly shifted in content focus, featuring anything and everything from current events to celebrity profiles. The encyclopaedia consulted for this study also contains entries which are normally restricted to dictionaries, such as for personal pronouns or articles, narrowing the distinction between these different kinds of resource types. Additionally, it features items that are normally found neither in general encyclopaedias nor dictionaries, such as 0 (the integer) or symbols (\emptyset , disambiguation). This content shift is insignificant for this study. Indeed, it may in fact increase the suitability of the resource type as the data for the cross-check thus becomes more diverse. Additionally, as with online dictionaries, digital encyclopaedias share features with electronic corpora that print editions do not.

The encyclopaedia used in the neologism cross-check for this project was Wikipedia, both because of its immense (and continually increasing) number of entries as well as the fact that its query function retrieves not only entries but any occurrence of the queried item within each entry. Wikipedia is exclusively web-based. It was first launched in 2001 and is now available in 286 different dialects and languages. Its German subcomponent (<http://de.wikipedia.org/>), which by default is searchable separately from other Wikipedia sections, currently has more than 1.8 million entries (March 2015).¹⁷ The total number of tokens composing these entries is not known.

For the cross-check, it is both occurrence and quantity of occurrence that matter. The former is most significant (and, indeed, in print encyclopaedia, it is the only measurement available) as any item featured in an encyclopaedia will have some level of conventionalisation. That is, entries are included precisely because they are in use, even if only rarely or exclusively within a specific field, so that individuals not familiar with them may look them up. In other words, any item that has an encyclopaedic entry is highly unlikely to be a neologism. With the digital Wikipedia it is possible to apply quantity of occurrences as a second measurement that can further corroborate a word's status, and, in cases where there are usages but no entries, this measurement may be decisive.¹⁸

General corpora

Corpora were the only resources used in the cross-check that were specifically designed for linguistic research. As with dictionaries and encyclopaedias, the choice was for large corpora containing as many lexical items from general

¹⁷ At the time the data was retrieved, it stood at more than 1.5 million entries (May 2013).

¹⁸ To obtain quantities, Wikipedia users must query the database either by following a particular path from the left-side column (*Werkzeuge* → *Spezialseiten* → *Suche* for the German Wikipedia section) or by clicking the magnifying glass symbol in the *Search*-box on the top right of the page, as direct queries via the search boxes either on the front portal for all of Wikipedia (www.wikipedia.org/) or on the language-specific front pages currently do not provide any numbers (May 2013).

language usage as possible. Two general, monolingual corpora of the German language were selected: the DWDS and COSMAS II. The DWDS (short for Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, <<http://www.dwds.de>>) is an online resource owned by the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. The DWDS is, as its name already indicates, not only a corpus in the strictest sense of the word but includes a general dictionary, an etymological dictionary, a thesaurus and a word profiler application in addition to a large corpus consisting of three different sections (*Referenzkorpus*, *Zeitungskorpus* and *Spezialkorpus*) with multiple subcorpora each. Most texts date from the twentieth century. In the cross-check the primary focus of evaluation was on data from the *Kernkorpus 20/21* (123 million tokens) and *Zeit & Zeit Online* (226 million tokens) subcorpora.

COSMAS II (Corpus Search, Management and Analysis System, <<http://www.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2/web-app/>>) is a project of the Institut für Deutsche Sprache (IDS), which is available as an application for different platforms. In this case the web-based resource was used. Its data come predominantly from the Deutsches Referenzkorpus (DeReKo, <<http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/dereko/>>), a government-funded joint research project of several academic institutions, as well as from IDS project groups. The corpus currently contains 7.3 billion tokens within 108 subcorpora and includes a wide range of texts: newspapers, airline magazines, bibliographical literature, twentieth and twenty-first century prose fiction, historical texts and encyclopaedia entries.

With this resource type, occurrence but especially quantity of occurrence was important when evaluating an item's neologism status. Unlike with the previous two resources (dictionaries and encyclopaedias), the purpose of corpora is not to provide single entries with definitions and explanations but to retrieve all examples of a lexical item from its database of texts to provide insight into its language usage patterns. As general corpora contain texts of many different types and from a wide range of sources to be as representative of language in general as possible, a single occurrence of a lexical item does not automatically disqualify it from being a neologism nor makes it 'highly unlikely' for it to be a coinage, as applied for dictionaries and encyclopaedias. A single or even a few individual hits may well be examples of a neologism in use, for example, in a literary text or in a newspaper article, both texts types which in German will often feature newly coined words. Each occurrence therefore needs to be checked manually, with the total quantity also becoming a determining factor: the greater the number of hits and the wider the range of texts in which the hits occur, the less likely it is that the item in question is a neologism.¹⁹

The combined use of the DWDS and COSMAS provided a sufficiently large database for the cross-check and the somewhat different focus in their

¹⁹ In the case of DWDS, although the primary focus was on data from *Kernkorpus 20/21* and *Zeit & Zeit Online*, the cross-check also took into account whether a query retrieved hits in other subsections (the dictionaries, the thesaurus or the word profilers), as such occurrences were likely to rule out an item's neologism status.

components extended the range. The fact that both included historical subcorpora, with data from the time of publication of the ST and also before, was an added advantage, even more so since the dictionary and encyclopaedia sources were contemporary. Occurrence in both was not deemed necessary to declare a queried item as a non-coinage because quantity and range of occurrence within a single corpus were considered more important. Similarly, even if hits were retrieved from both the DWDS and COSMAS, this did not immediately disqualify an item as a neologism, even if in most instances it provided stronger evidence. Despite the immense total size of the two corpora together, non-occurrence was not enough to declare an item's neologism status; in this case confirmation from the other resource types was essential.

Web search engines

The final resource for the cross-check were web-based search engines. The web as corpus – i.e. trawling the internet with the help of web search engines – is still a controversial tool in linguistic research. Although it is not the only cross-check resource that is not primarily intended for linguistic analysis, it is likely the most problematic. While it is standard for dictionaries and encyclopaedias to include at least some information about their composition, the compilation process and the contributors involved as well as metadata about each document contained, there are no such conventions for online resources. The most widely used search engines are owned by multinational corporations, which closely guard details on how their tools operate, often resulting in a lack of transparency in terms of how search engines index, retrieve and sort data. The exact total size and content of indexed materials is unknown and, given the immensity and the ever-changing form of the internet, not just difficult but essentially impossible to ascertain. The constant and comparatively rapid change of online content also means that exact replication of queries is not an option due to the impermanence of the data retrieved and factors such as cookies and individual browsing history which influence web searches.²⁰ Archives, such as the Wayback Machine (<www.archives.org>) for preserved webpages from the past, are incomplete and not directly linked to specific search engines. Additionally, any changes in a search engine's mechanisms (e.g. in the algorithms that sort results) may be less well documented or not made available to the public, in contrast with resources specifically intended for linguistic research.²¹ While web search engines are thus at best an imperfect resource, they are not completely useless and, at least in combination with other resources as done here, provide information that can assist in determining a lexical item's neologism status.

Three search engines were used in the cross-check – Google Search, Bing, and Yahoo! Search – as they are among the websites used most frequently (in terms of numbers of queries and users) as well as most widely (geographical

²⁰ Given its medium, the data retrieved through web search engine changes more rapidly than print sources but probably also more than most other online resources.

²¹ Indeed, the query language originally used to retrieve exact phrases (January 2013) seems to have changed (December 2014).

reach).²² Google Search, owned by Google Inc., indexes billions of webpages which the search engine then trawls to retrieve keyword hits and list them in abbreviated form with links to respective source pages. Search results are sorted with the help of a patented algorithm-based mechanism called PageRank, although other factors may influence the ranking. Bing and Yahoo! Search, owned by Microsoft and Yahoo! Inc. respectively, proceed similarly.²³ The percentage of total webpages indexed by any of these search engines is unknown and, indeed, probably unknowable. Non-indexable data (the so-called Deep Web), such as websites that require registration and login for access, unlinked content and non-html content, is normally excluded from search engine results. For all three search engines, country-specific sites and advanced setting to optimise results are available. However, unlike with all other cross-check resources used, none allows for lemma-based queries, meaning that at this stage of the cross-check base forms of the specific lexical items were used: infinitives in the case for verbs, singular forms in the nominative case for nouns and adjectives. The query language was specific for each search engine but consistently applied for each search with the particular search engine to maximise the comparability of the data. As stated previously, with this resource, quantity of occurrence was the most important factor.

5. Data analysis

5.1 ST neologisms: Classifications

The final list contained 107 neologisms that were classified into a number of distinct categories: there were compound coinages (either with or without a hyphen), neologisms by derivation, creative variants of existing forms as well as new creations that used a combination of strategies or were otherwise difficult to classify. An explanation of the different types of coinages used by Mann follows below.²⁴

5.1.1 Compound coinages

Compounding, a common process of word formation in German, was present in the ST in two forms: as hyphenated and non-hyphenated compounds.

²² The Alexa rankings (<<http://www.alexa.com>>) – a company which provides statistics for web traffic data and ranks websites on the basis of page views and visitors averaged over three months – for the search engines are as follows: 1 (Google), 16 (Bing) and 4 (Yahoo). This ranking (from April 2013) currently makes google.com the website with the most traffic. The only other two search engines that appear in the top 16 are baidu.com (5), google.co.in (12) and yahoo.co.jp (15), which are regional.

²³ Yahoo! Search and Bing are currently partnered for their web search. Results from the two search engines are similar but not identical.

²⁴ The HA and the BA are 97.4 % identical. There is no significant difference in terms of neologisms.

5.1.2 Hyphenated compounds

Spelling alternatives (SPA, 15 examples):	Amethyst-Geschmeide; Bäder-Hotel; Balkan-Idiomen; Friedrich-Roman; Gondel-Halteplatz; Granatapfel-Getränk; Hotel-Angestellte; Hotel-Personal; Lach-Refrain; Maja-Welt; Morgen-Eleganz; Prosa-Epopöe; Reise-Schreibmappe; Sebastian-Gestalt; Seemanns-Überjacke
Nominalisation (NOM, 9 examples):	Amtlich-Erzieherische (das); Einsam-Stumme (der); Einsam-Wache (der); Geschliffen-Herkömmliche (das); Göttlich-Nichtssagende (das); Mustergültig-Feststehende (das); Nebelhaft-Grenzenlose (das); Tapfer-Sittliche (das); Verheißungsvoll-Ungeheure (das)
Double adjectives (DADJ, 19 examples):	ängstlich-übermütig; bräunlich-ledern; dumpf-süß; feurig-festlich; gefährlich-lieulich; gutmütig-häßlich; heilig-nüchtern; heilig-schattig; hochherzig-unwirtschaftlich; keck-behaglich; komisch-heilig; komisch-traumartig; körperhaft-geistig; leidend-tätig; plastisch-dramatisch; schwermütig-enthusiastisch; süßlich-offizinell; üppig-untauglich; wunderlich-wundersam

Table 1: Hyphenated compounds in *Der Tod in Venedig*, according to type

This kind of compounding, in which lexical items are linked by an en dash, is atypical in German but notably prevalent in *Der Tod in Venedig* with 43 examples (the full list is given in Table 1). Mann's hyphenated compounds, however, are not all equal and come in different forms, some of which are more creative than others. They may be mere spelling variants of existing words, as is easily revealed by removing the hyphen and joining the compound's components without any space in between: *Bäder-Hotel* → *Bäderhotel*, *Hotel-Angestellte* → *Hotelangestellte* and *Granatapfel-Getränk* → *Granatapfelgetränk* are some examples. Although these types of compounds are marked in the sense that they use non-standard spelling and were included in the final count, they arguably demonstrate stylistic preference more so than creativity. Other hyphenated compounds generally fell into two subcategories. A significant number (nineteen) were composed of two adjectives connected through the hyphen (*ängstlich-übermütig*, *dumpf-süß*, *heilig-schattig*, et cetera), the components being notably distinct in terms of meaning, to the point of being a seemingly nonsensical combination. The contrast emphasised the creativity on the part of Mann, with the unconventional compounds taking on both a new form and meaning. The other type of hyphenated compound, with nine examples present, was similar, consisting also of two adjectives but additionally involved nominalisation, thus resulting in forms such as (*das*) *Nebelhaft-Grenzenlose*, (*das*) *Tapfer-Sittliche* and (*das*) *Verheißungsvoll-Ungeheure*.

5.1.3 Non-hyphenated compounds

Abendtracht; Abschiedshonneurs; Allerweltsferienplatz; Alltagsstätte; Bartfliege; Bettelvirtuose; Croupiergewandtheit; Dämmerblässe; dickdunstig; Einzelinspiration; Farrengewucher; Fäulnisdunst; Fernluft; Fieberdunst; Fremdenpoesie; Gasthofssitte; Gepäckbeförderungsamt; Glücksfrist; Greisenlippe; Instinktverschmelzung; Jünglingsentführerin; Jünglingserkenntnis / Jünglingserkenntnisse; Jünglingssehnsucht; kleinweltlich; Kunstlachen; Künstlerfurcht; Löwenbalkon; Massenzutrauen; Plauderwort; Promenadenquai; Raumeswüste; Romanteppich; rotbewimpert; sargschwarz; schwergeschmückt; traumglücklich; Urteilsaustausch; Urweltwildnis; Versuchsaufenthalt; Wanderergestalt; weißbeschiene; Weltbummelei; Willensverzückung.

Table 2: Non-hyphenated compounds in *Der Tod in Venedig*

Non-hyphenated compounds, i.e. the joining of two or more lexical items with no punctuation mark or space to delineate the 'border' between components were, with forty-three instances, used as frequently as hyphenated compounds (see Table 2). They virtually always were formed by two parts and were predominantly nouns (*Allerweltsferienplatz*, *Bettelvirtuose*), although a few adjective compounds were used also (*dickdunstig*, *traumglücklich*). Like with the hyphenated compounds some combinations were unconventional and striking, others were rather classic formations (e.g. *Gepäckbeförderungsamt*). Non-hyphenated compounds were different from hyphenated ones not only because they lacked hyphens. Compounds demonstrated greater diversity in their composition, joining nouns with adjectives (such as the *traumglücklich* mentioned above) or drawing on participles (*schwergeschmückt*). Notably, there were no nominalised adjective compounds. Unsurprisingly, the various types of compounds used by Mann exhibit different degrees of creativity. While it cannot be exactly quantified, it is noticeable.

5.1.4 Derivation

beutelschneiderisch; Halbschurke (der); Tagedieberei (die)
--

Table 3: Neologisms by derivation

Neologisms formed through derivation (Table 3), specifically affixation, constitute another type of neologism used by Mann. Affixation – i.e. the adding of a morpheme to the stem of a word, either by placing a semantic unit before (prefix), within (infix) or after (suffix) of the item – is a somewhat questionable tool for creativity as the practice is often highly productive. Many affixes are used on a regular basis and have become conventionalised. Neologisms by affixation were thus not included outright.

While a handful appeared on L2 (*Halbschurke*, *Tagedieberei*, *beutelschneiderisch*, *grundsonderbar*, *übermodisch*, *korridorartig*, *nonnenähnlich*), only the first three made onto the final list. None of the items made an appearance in any of the first three cross-check resource types, with only web search engines retrieving data. The number of hits were comparatively similar for *beutelschneiderisch*, *grundsonderbar*, *Halbschurke* and *nonnenähnlich* (for Google 651, 358, 545 and 484 respectively) but somewhat to significantly higher for *korridorartig*, *Tagedieberei* and *übermodisch* (for Google 2503, 1690 and 931 respectively), providing good reason to exclude *korridorartig* and *übermodisch* on this basis. Although numbers were also high for *Tagedieberei* – indeed, higher than for *übermodisch* –, the item made onto the final neologism list. Both in the case of *Tagedieberei* and also *beutelschneiderisch*, the root word was more unusual and affixation resulted in a more striking item. The Google hits also proved interesting, especially for *Tagedieberei*, where quite a few linked to empty dictionary hits,²⁵ to *Der Tod in Venedig* related textual materials (including links related to a 2012 Thomas Mann exhibition titled “Stegreifleben und Tagedieberei”) as well as some websites where the word was used together with other obvious neologisms.²⁶ As for *Halbschurke*, the data retrieved linked notably often to online versions of the novella, again making some hits irrelevant. With *Halbschurke* there was also a semantic difference that provided reason to include it on the final list: The prefixes of the omitted items *grund-* and *über-* are used for emphasis, while the suffixes *-artig* and *-ähnlich* indicate comparison. None of these, however, modifies the meaning of the word stem in a more profound way, something which does not apply for *Halb-* in this instance. It is a prefix that indicates quantity, but for a word that is not normally quantified in such manner: *Schurke* (*rascal*, *wretch*) refers to a person, yet a person cannot literally be halved, only metaphorically. The use of affixation is thus more novel in this manner and, with

²⁵ Search engine queries included noise in the data retrieved. One type of irrelevant hit were empty dictionary hits, which, on Google’s list, appeared to suggest a dictionary entry for the word queried but, once accessing the link, only revealed a query page with an error message indicating that the item was not found in the dictionary.

²⁶ For example, one blog (<http://www.flaneursalon.de/de/depeschen.php?sel=20080128&block=4>, accessed 20 Jan. 2014) writes “*Computerei* ist eine Art *Tagedieberei*” (my emphasis).

hits being sufficiently low, justifies inclusion for this reason. While such an argument cannot be made for the other suffixes *-isch* (denoting associated qualities) and *-ei* (signalling an activity or the domain of an activity), and while at least with *Tagedieberei* hits were comparatively high, intuitive judgment ultimately overruled these concerns, with both *Tagedieberei* and *beutelstecherisch* being classified as coinages.

5.1.5 Conversion

Befallene (der); Enthusiasmierter (der)*; gluthauchend*; keimbekämpfend; Rosenstreuen (das); Weiterkommende* (der)

Table 4: Neologisms by conversion (including double conversions, marked with *)

Conversion, as noted previously, is a particularly productive process in the German language and not necessarily creative. *Der Tod in Venedig*, unsurprisingly, contains many examples of conversions throughout (e.g. *das Gesetzmäßige* from the adjective *gesetzmäßig*, *das Klappern* and *das Ausschlafen* from the verbs *klappern* and *ausschlafen* respectively), but these were generally not included in the final list of neologisms due to productivity. Items that did make it onto the final list were all somewhat atypical, involving in place of a single word item, a short phrase (e.g. *Keime bekämpfen* → *keimbekämpfend*) or applied the conversion process to a word more than once (marked with an asterisk Table 4), as with *Enthusiasmierter*, derived from the word *enthusiasmieren*, which is turned, in the form of a past participle, into an adjective (*enthusiasmierter*) and then nominalised. Such formations arguably have a lower level of innovation than some other types of neologisms, but are nonetheless striking to users.

5.1.6 Creative variation on an existing form

Halbdame

Table 5: Neologism as a creative variant of an existing form

One item, *Halbdame*, demonstrated creativity by taking an existing lexical item but altering it in some way, something that we often also refer to as wordplay. In wordplay original items are generally still recognisable, although only to individuals familiar with them, with a change occurring both on the formal and the semantic level. While *Halbdame* on the surface looked like a neologism by prefixation (similar to *Halbschurke* above), it is in fact derived from the word *Halbweltdame* and, by extension, *Halbwelt*. The latter is defined as “eine elegant auftretende, aber zwielichte, anrühige Gesellschaftsschicht”²⁷ in the online Duden, with a *Halbweltdame* being “eine der Halbwelt angehörende Frau”²⁸. Mann’s *Halbdame* appears in a sentence in Chapter 3, “Die

²⁷ “A social class that appears elegant but is shady and infamous” (my translation).

²⁸ “A woman that is a member of the *Halbwelt*” (my translation and emphasis).

Gouvernante, eine kleine und korpulente *Halbdame* mit rotem Gesicht, gab endlich das Zeichen, sich zu erheben”²⁹ (my emphasis), playing with the source words both in form and meaning. While *Halbwelt* and *Halbweltdame* connote the seedy underworld and are heavily negative, Mann’s creation shifts meanings and connotations. The immediate sentence context contains some negativity in terms of the woman’s physical appearance (she is “korpulent” and has a “rotes Gesicht”) and also references social class, however, there is no indication, either in the text that frames the word immediately nor in the novella as a whole, that she belongs to a “zweilichte, anrühige Gesellschaftsschicht”. Although the suggestion is that she is of a different and lower social class than her employers, the negativity is somewhat lessened through the disassociation. Again it is notable that *Halbdame*, like *Halbschurke* mentioned earlier, cannot be interpreted literally, only metaphorically, making the coinage more striking on this level.

5.1.7 Other types of coinages: Creative combinations

Aufrechthaltende (der/die); ausstürmend; breitgeästet; breitschattend; halbgeflüstert; Hinabgesunkene (der); Lebehoch (das); Stegreifdasein (das); Unbärtige (der); vorwärtskehrend; Wandererhafte (das).

Table 6: Neologisms by combining multiple word formation processes

Finally, a handful of items were more challenging to classify. Instead of relying on a single strategy for innovation, they make use of several simultaneously. Although there are not many such coinages in Mann’s *Venedig* (see Table 6), this strategy of creative combination where multiple word formation processes are applied to a single item one after the other, was to be expected, as it reflects the organic development of language. In most instances the word creation was fairly straightforward, e.g. *Stegreifdasein* is formed from the fixed phrase *aus dem Stegreif* by first deconstructing the phrase into its parts and then combining the noun component with *Dasein*. With *halbgeflüstert* however, the exact order of the different formation strategies applied was not so clearly identifiable: the word might have been formed either by turning the verb *flüstern* into an adjective through its past participle form, *geflüstert*, with the prefix being added after. Alternatively, Mann may have taken the noun *Geflüster* as the starting point.

The different types of neologisms present in *Der Tod in Venedig* reveal the linguistic preferences of Mann, demonstrating not only a varied range of linguistic creativity but providing different kinds of challenges for the translators.

²⁹ “The governess, a small and corpulent *Halbdame* with a red face, finally gave the sign to rise” (my translation and emphasis).

5.2 Creativity in the translation of neologisms

Data analysis reveals that Mann's neologisms are nearly always removed in the English versions of *Der Tod in Venedig* as all the translators demonstrate a strong preference for fluent translations.³⁰ More than nine times out of ten coinages are replaced by lexically conventional options, while creative choices are the exception and occur not only infrequently but seemingly also arbitrarily.

As can be noted in Table 7 below, on average only 7.05 % of the neologisms on L3 are rendered creatively in translation, with Koelb most often using non-conventional solutions (in nine out of 107 instances, or 8.41 % of the time) and Neugroschel and Doege the least (in six instances, or 5.61 % of the time). The overall percentage average is not only strikingly small, but with less than 3 % difference between the most and least creative translations, the evidence is not sufficiently compelling to declare any one TT as 'more' or 'less creative' in terms of translating neologisms. What can be said, however, is that preserving neologisms is clearly not a priority in any of the target texts.

³⁰ See Venuti (1995) for more information on fluency in translation.

	Burke 1 (1924)	Low- Porter (1928)	Burke 2 (1970)	Luke (1988)	Koelb (1994)	Appel- baum (1995)	Neu- groschel (1998)	Chase (1999)	Heim	Doege (2007)	Hansen & Hansen (2012)	Totals (all TTs)
Compound	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	32
Compound with hyphen	0	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
Conversion	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	9
Combination	2	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	22
Creative variant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Derivation	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	7
Totals (by TT)	7	8	8	8	9	7	6	8	8	6	8	83
Neologisms kept in TTs (of 107 items)	6.54%	7.48%	7.48%	7.48%	8.41%	6.54%	5.61%	7.48%	7.48%	5.61%	7.48%	7.05%

Table 7: Creative translations by translator and neologism category

Some variations can be seen with the type of neologism. Compounds, both with and without hyphens, are the most frequently occurring kind of neologisms. In translation, non-hyphenated compounds are rendered creatively more often (6.77 %) than hyphenated ones (2.75 %), although both the percentages as well as the percentage difference between the two compound categories remain small. Within the hyphenated compound category, there is minimal variation among compounds that are spelling alternatives (SPA), double adjectives (DADJ) or nominalisations (NOM). The last are normalised in all instances, while spelling alternatives and double adjectives have preservation rates of 3.64 % and 3.35 % respectively (see also Table 8). The complete normalisation of nominalisation is somewhat surprising, given that in terms of degree of creativity in the ST these are more striking than spelling alternatives, whose inclusion on the neologism list is debatable, yet which at least remain creative in a handful of cases in the TTs. With other types of ST neologisms, the majority are also eliminated across all targets texts, but preservation is generally higher than with compounds: conversions are rendered creatively 13.64 % of the time, while rates are 18.18 % for combinations and 20.45 % for derivations. The only exception is the creative variant category, which is never translated innovatively. The lower number of occurrence of all these types of neologisms compared to both compound types also makes it difficult to argue for any definite trends here.

Neologism Category and Type	Number of Creative Translations	Percentage (%)
Compounds (43)	32 of 473 ³¹	6.77
Compounds with Hyphen (43)	13 of 473	2.75
– Double Adjectives (DADJ, 19)	7 of 209	3.35
– Nominalisations (NOM, 9)	0 of 99	0
– Spelling Alternatives (SPA, 15)	6 of 165	3.64
Combinations (COM) 11	22 of 121	18.18
Conversions (CONV) 6	9 of 66	13.64
Derivations (DER) 3	7 of 33	20.45
Variant (1)	0 of 11	0
Neologisms: 107	83 of 1177	7.05

Table 8: Creative translations per neologism category and type

Overall, the decision of when to maintain creativity in the TTs seems to be largely random. Forms that are more creative are not necessarily more likely to be preserved (compare the data for different types of hyphenated compounds) and the distribution of TT neologisms is sporadic: in thirteen instances it is a single translation opts for a neologism, in four it is two translations, and in two instances it is three translations. Additionally, there are five examples

³¹ One neologism in the ST has, with eleven TTs, eleven potential instances where it could be rendered either creatively or normalised in translation. Hence, '32 out of 473' indicates 32 instances of creative translations in 473 potential moments, meaning that 32 creative forms appear across all TTs for 43 neologisms in the ST.

(*gluthauchend, breitschattend, halbgeflüstert, rotbewimpert, sargschwarz*) with which nearly all translators use an innovative form, yet show interestingly little variation (Table 9) among them, as most translators use the exact same coinage.

ST Neologism	TT Neologism
Breitschattend	broad-brimmed (7 translations) wide-brimmed (2 translations – Neugroschel and Chase)
Gluthauchend	fire-breathing (8 translations) heat-breathing (1 translation – Chase)
Halbgeflüstert	half-whispered (8 translations)
Rotbewimpert	red-lidded (both Burke translations) red-lashed (8 translations)
Sargschwarz	coffin-black (8 translations) matte-black (1 translation – Chase) coffin-black-varnished (1 translation – Doege)

Table 9: Neologisms with high TT preservation rates

Burke's *red-lidded* for *rotbewimpert* is likely a mistranslation. Chase's deviation is more interesting as he is the only one who, in three instances, opts not only for a creative form, but for one that is not identical to those chosen by the majority of other translators. The repeated neologisms, meanwhile, raise the question of whether later translators may be copying earlier ones here. Although it can only be speculated whether the same coinages being reused indicates not creativity but a lack thereof or whether the repetition occurs for other reasons,³² what is certain is that, in general, creativity is not only not a priority in the English versions of *Der Tod in Venedig*, but that the form it takes in translations is limited. Mann's neologisms fall into a number of different categories, whereas creative TT forms are, without exception, hyphenated compound words. Like in the ST, some of these are more striking than others, with some (e.g. *traveling-pad, gondola-landing*) barely amounting to more than spelling alternatives and others occasionally taking more daring forms (*coffin-black-varnished, cloud-swollen, melancholy-enthusiastic*), but no translator experiments with any other technique.

5.3 Normalisation in translation

The most common approach to neologisms in the TT corpus is thus normalisation, a strategy that Sara Laviosa describes as “the translator's sometimes conscious, sometimes unconscious rendering of idiosyncratic text features in such a way to make them conform to the typical textual characteristics of the target language” (2002: 54–55), with Mona Baker adding

³² As the examples in this chapter concern single lexical units rather than more extended phrases, limited variation may be explained, at least in some cases, by this factor. Rendering a word like 'sargschwarz' as 'coffin-black' is literal as well as sensible, and thus quite probable.

that it “exaggerate[s]” (qtd. in Laviosa 2002: 69) the typical target text features. Normalisation occurs either due to “systemic constraints of the target language” or “the translator’s own preferences” (Laviosa 2002: 69). Dorothy Kenny (2001) specifically refers to *lexical normalisation* throughout *Lexis and Creativity in Translation. A Corpus Based Study*; other related terms include *simplification*, *explicitation* and *naturalisation*. While there are some nuances in these words, they do not concern us especially in this paper, where the term *normalisation* is simply used to describe strategies that produce a fluent and conventional translation rather than a linguistically novel one.

Fluency in the target texts is rarely achieved through the complete elimination of a ST neologism; only a handful of omissions are present in total. Koelb removes *schwergeschmückt*, Lowe-Porter *üppig-untauglich*, *Befallenen* (with some compensation, another rarely used tactic) and *Gepäckbeförderungsamts*, the last of which is also omitted by Doege, as are *breitschattend*, *bräunlich-ledern* and *Glücksfrist* – too few to reveal any clear patterns, whether in terms of translators (i.e. which ones have a tendency to omit coinages) or translation strategies (i.e. when omissions take place). Generally, translators transform neologisms into conventionalised items, which come in any form imaginable and are greatly varied, for example, reducing creative words to their bare minimum with single unit items sometimes even at the cost of meaning (*Dämmerblässe* as *paleness*; *Fremdenpoesie* as *song*; *Massenzutrauen* as *trust*) to increasingly complex grammatical structures (such as established compounds, multi-part noun phrases and relative clauses). This observation applies to all categories of neologisms, although some distinctions can be made in terms of conventionalisation that takes place depending on the type of neologism concerned.

5.3.1 Hyphenated compounds

Spelling alternatives typically are translated with non-hyphenated compounds consisting of two nouns (e.g. *Granatapfel-Getränk/pomegranate drink*; *Amethyst-Geschmeiden/amethyst jewelry*) or noun phrases that are post-modified with prepositional phrases (*Friedrich-Roman/novel on Friedrich*; *Maja-Welt/world of Maia*). Although there is of course occasional variation with some items (*Seemanns-Überjacke* is rendered with a possessive in most TTs) and on the part of individual translators (Chase opts for “a chorus in which the entire ensemble laughed as hard as it could” for *Lach-Refrain*, in contrast to *laugh refrain* or *laughing refrain* chosen by others), the translations are generally straightforward, at least compared to NOM neologisms. These are sometimes rendered with simple constructions in the English versions (e.g. two adjectives or nouns joined by the conjunction *and*, a noun with a qualifying adjective), however, more extensive rephrasing is increasingly seen, as demonstrated by several of the translators – Burke, Lowe-Porter, Luke, Neugroschel, Heim – in Table 10:

Einsam-Stumme	
Burke 1 (1924)	a man who lives alone and in silence
Lowe-Porter (1928)	A solitary, unused to speaking of what he sees and feels
Burke 2 (1970)	a man who lives alone and in silence
Luke (1988)	a devotee of solitude and silence
Koelb (1994)	A lonely, quiet person
Appelbaum (1995)	a solitary, taciturn man
Neugroschel (1998)	a loner who seldom speaks
Chase (1999)	the solitary and silent
Heim (2004)	a man of solitude and few words
Doege (2007)	the solitary and mute one
Hansen & Hansen (2012)	the solitary, taciturn man

Table 10: Einsam-Stumme neologism in TTs

NOM neologisms are complex items. They provide a challenge due to nominalisation, which exists in English, but which, makes in comparison with German for a more marked (due to being a less productive word formation process) as well as more ambiguous word (due to absence of inflections). Chase's translation "the solitary and silent" illustrates: embedded in the clause "[t]he observations and chance encounters of *the solitary and silent* are more blurred" (my emphasis), the words can refer to either a person (a person that is solitary and silent) or a state of existence (solitariness, silence). The majority of translators clarify through grammatical changes, e.g. transforming the ST nouns into adjectives paired with an explanatory noun (*one, man, person*) or use other, more fluent solutions such as relative (B1 and B2, N) or participle clauses (LP's particularly extensive rendition).

The third type of hyphenated compounds, DADJ neologisms, also manifests specific translation preferences. Hyphens are removed from the adjective unit, as it is virtually always split into two parts. Adjectives are often kept, although in some cases one component may be changed to an adverb or a noun. Punctuation or conjunctions may be added. Two representative examples can be seen with *ängstlich-übermütig* and *bräunlich-ledern* in Table 11 (below).

DADJ and NOM neologisms are similar in some ways in that both involve the linking of two items with a hyphen that, except for word order, are equal: the components of the whole unit qualify each other, rather than one acting only as the modifier for the other. In translation this equality may be lost, particularly if one component is transformed into a different word category. The addition of conjunctions with some DADJ is also interesting, especially when *but* and *yet* are used as these verbalise contrast which is sometimes implicit (*schweremütig-enthusiastisch / melancholy yet enthusiastic*, my emphasis) and sometimes not

	ängstlich-übermütig	bräunlich-ledern
Burke 1 (1924)	nervousness and ebullience	leatherish brown
Lowe-Porter (1928)	panic and thrills	brown and leathery
Burke 2 (1970)	nervousness and ebullience	leatherish brown
Luke (1988)	anxiously exuberant	brown and leathery
Koelb (1994)	Anxious	brown and leathery
Appelbaum (1995)	anxious but merry	brownish and leathery
Neugroschel (1998)	anxious and rollocking	brownish and leathery
Chase (1999)	Anxious	leathery brown
Heim (2004)	anxious yet high-spirited	brownish and leathery
Doege (2007)	fearfully wanton	(omits part of the ST sentence, including the neologism)
Hansen & Hansen (2012)	fearful, jaunty	leathery and brown

Table 11: Translations for two typical DADJ neologisms

linking of two lexical units through hyphenation also means that the sense of the resulting item is not quite the same as that when the two units are interpreted separately, even more so as most combinations are unexpected and seemingly contradictory (as the just mentioned *schwermütig-enthusiastisch* illustrates). The separation of the lexical components thus implies a shift in meaning, which may be slight, but is nonetheless present as part of the normalisation process.

5.3.2 Non-hyphenated compounds

Non-hyphenated compounds show the same kind of fluency as other neologisms. While quite a range of different solutions are offered by translators, the use of noun phrases is prevalent with N + N compounds (no hyphen but a space between nouns, e.g. *Farrengewucher / fern clusters*; *Gepäckbeförderungsamtsamt / luggage office*), ADJ + N phrases (e.g. *Allerweltsferienplatz / cosmopolitan resort*; *Greisenlippe / senile lips*) and N + of + N constructions (e.g. *Glücksfrist / period of happiness*; *Raumeswüste / wilderness of space*) dominating.

5.3.3 Creative variant of existing forms

The single ST example of a creative variant neologism is normalised in all TTs (Table 12). Two translators (Lowe-Porter, Doege) use a hypernym that results in a partial loss of meaning, while the remaining translators try to preserve the *Halb-* part of the original coinage by using a range of syntactic constructions, including AJD + NP, NP with a post-modifying PP and participle clauses, with all TTs confirming the preference for fluency.

	Halbdame
Burke 1 (1924)	middle-class woman
Lowe-Porter (1928)	Person
Burke 2 (1970)	middle-class woman
Luke (1988)	unladylike woman
Koelb (1994)	unladylike woman
Appelbaum (1995)	woman, not quite a lady,
Neugroschel (1998)	something of a gentlewoman
Chase (1999)	lady of mixed family
Heim (2004)	woman of not quite gentle birth
Doege (2007)	Dame
Hansen & Hansen (2012)	lady of less than aristocratic birth

Table 12: Translations for *Halbdame*

5.3.4 Other: Derivations, conversions and creative combinations

While neologisms that are derivations, conversions or creative combinations of multiple word formation processes are rendered creatively more frequently than compounds or the single creative variant example, normalisation is still the most dominant translation strategy. Fluent TT forms are diverse and, in contrast to other neologism types, demonstrate no clear preferences for a particular way of translating. Given the varied composition particularly of creative combinations, the absence of a dominant common pattern is, however, not so surprising: the divergent semantic and morphological complexity in items such as *ausstürmend* and (*der*) *Weiterherkommende* are more likely to require a wider range of translational solutions than some other neologism types.

6. Conclusion

While neologisms may not be a particularly dominant feature in Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig*, this makes them no less significant. Different types of neologisms are used in the novella, with compounds (both with and without hyphens) being employed most often, but conversions, derivations, a creative variant of an existing form and creative combinations involving multiple word formation processes all also featuring. As was to be expected, Mann's neologisms vary in their degree of innovation. Indeed, some neologisms, like SPA hyphenated compounds, may display stylistic preferences more so than linguistic creativity. The treatment of the ST neologisms in translation is, however, surprisingly uniform, given the large number of TTs and the extended time period of nearly ninety years that they span: they nearly always disappear as translators opt for normalisation. When neologisms are preserved in translation – between 6.54 and 8.41 percent of the time – less innovation is present. TT coinages are, without exception, hyphenated compounds. These compounds, like Mann's, vary in their creativity. However, no translator experiments with any other word formation technique. Interestingly, the few coinages that are rendered creatively in most translations (i.e. by eight or more

TTs), see the exact same form used by all but one or two translators, demonstrating less creativity overall than Mann.

The fact that all English *Der Tod in Venedig* translations approach neologisms in a similar manner raises questions about the so-called Retranslation Hypothesis that proposes, among other things, that early TT versions tend to domesticate while later ones increasingly foreignise. The data retrieved as part of this study so far show no such indication. It seems to corroborate those critics who have challenged the Retranslation Hypothesis and argue that retranslation is a complex phenomenon where “historical context, norms, ideology, the translator’s agency and intertextuality” (Gürçağlar 233) must all be considered. As this paper focuses exclusively on ST neologisms in translation and also does not inquire into the background of how the different English *Venices* came to be and which factors may be influencing translational choices, additional exploration is needed in order to determine whether the uniformly domesticating approach applies not only for neologisms, but also other forms of linguistic creativity or even more generally for Mann’s novella. Furthermore, it still needs to be investigated whether translators add any creative coinages of their own – independent of the ST – that may compensate for the normalisation of Mann’s neologisms in other parts of the text.

References

- Baker, Mona (1996). Corpus-Based Translation Studies: The Challenges That Lie Ahead. Terminology, LSP and Translation. Studies in Language Engineering in Honour of Juan C. Sager, ed. Harold Somers. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 175–186.
- Bensimon, Paul (1990). Présentation. Palimpsestes 13, ix–xiii.
- Berman, Antoine (1990). La retraduction comme espace de la traduction, Palimpsestes 13, 1–7.
- Bing. <http://www.bing.de>. N. p., n.d.
- Brisset, Annie (2004). Retraduire ou le corps changeant de la connaissance sur l’historicité de la traduction, Palimpsestes 15, 39–67.
- Brownlie, Siobhan (2006). Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory, Across Languages and Cultures 7(2), 145–170.
- Chesterman, Andrew (2000). A Causal Model for Translation Studies. Intercultural Faultlines. Research Models in Translation Studies I, ed. Maeve Olohan. Manchester: St. Jerome, 15–28.
- COSMAS II. Corpus Search, Management and Analysis System. Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim. Available at: <http://www.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2/web-app/>. N.p., n.d.
- Deane, Sharon L. (2011). Confronting the Retranslation Hypothesis: Flaubert and Sand in the British Literary System. Doctoral thesis, University of Edinburgh. Available at: <https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1842/5494/Deane2011.pdf?sequence=2>.

- Deane-Cox, Sharon (2014). *Retranslation: Literature and Reinterpretation*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Deutsches Referenzkorpus. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/dereko/>. N. p., n.d.
- Duden. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. <http://www.duden.de>. N. p., n.d.
- Duden. *Die deutsche Rechtschreibung* (2013). 26th ed. Berlin: Dudenverlag.
- DWDS. *Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. <http://www.dwds.de>. N. p., n.d.
- Google Search. <http://www.google.com>. N. p., n.d.
- Grimm, Jacob & Grimm, Wilhem (1852–1960). *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. <http://dwb.uni-trier.de/de/>. N. p.
- Gürçağlar, Şehnaz Tahir (2009). *Retranslation*. *The Routledge Encyclopaedia for Translation Studies*, eds. Mona Baker & Gabriela Saldanha. London and New York: Routledge, 233–236.
- Hentschel, Elke ed. (2010). *Deutsche Grammatik*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.
- Kenny, Dorothy (2001). *Lexis and Creativity in Translation. A Corpus Based Study*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.
- Konitzer, Alfred ed. (1999). *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Munich: Bertelsmann.
- Koskinen, Kaisa & Paloposki, Outi (2003). *Retranslations in the Age of Digital Reproduction. Tradução, retradução e adaptação*, eds. John Milton & Marie-Hélène Catherine Torres. *Special issue of Cadernos de Tradução* 1(11), 19–38.
- Laviosa, Sara (2002). *Corpus-Based Translation Studies: Theories, Findings, Applications*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Leo. <http://dict.leo.org>. N. p., n.d.
- Mann, Thomas (1912). *Der Tod in Venedig*. *Die neue Rundschau* Oct. 1912, 1368–1398.
- (1912). *Der Tod in Venedig*. *Die neue Rundschau* Nov. 1912, 1499–1526.
- (1913). *Der Tod in Venedig*. Munich: Hyperionverlag.
- (1913). *Der Tod in Venedig*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- ([1924] 1965). *Death in Venice*. Trans. Kenneth Burke. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- ([1928] 1972). *Death in Venice*. Trans. H. T. Lowe-Porter. Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books.
- (1970). *Death in Venice*. Trans. Kenneth Burke. Revised ed. New York: Random House.
- ([1988] 1990). *Death in Venice. Death in Venice and Other Stories*. Trans. David Luke. London: Secker and Warburg, 197–267.
- (1994). *Death in Venice*. Trans. Clayton Koelb. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- (1995). *Death in Venice*. Trans. Stanley Appelbaum. New York: Dover Publications.
- (1998). *Death in Venice. Death in Venice and Other Tales*. Trans. Joachim Neugroschel. New York: Viking Penguin, 285–366.

- ([1999] 2006). *Death in Venice. Death in Venice and Other Stories*. Trans. Jefferson S. Chase. New York: Signet Classics, 139–218.
- (2004). *Death in Venice*. Trans. Michael Henry Heim. New York: Harper Collins.
- (2007). *Death in Venice*. Trans. Martin Doege.
<https://archive.org/details/DeathInVenice>.
- ([2012] 2013). *Death in Venice*. Trans. Thomas S. Hansen and Abby J. Hansen. Deer Harbor, WA: eNotated Classics.
- Milton, John & Torres, Marie-Hélène Catherine eds. (2003). Tradução, retradução e adaptação. Special issue of *Cadernos de Tradução* 1(11). N. p.
- OED Online. Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford University Press. <http://www.oed.com/>. N.d.
- OWID. Online-Wortschatz-Informationssystem Deutsch. Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim. <http://www.owid.de>. N. p., n.d.
- Paloposki, Outi & Koskinen, Kaisa (2004). A Thousand and One Rranslations: Revisiting Retranslation. Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies, eds. Gyde Hansen, Kerstin Malmkjær & Daniel Gile. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 27–38.
- Pons. Pons Online Wörterbuch. <http://www.pons.de>. N. p., n.d.
- Pym, Anthony (1998). *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Scott, Mike (2012). WordSmith Tools Version 6. N. pag.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem (2006). Multiple-Entry Visa to Travelling Theory: Retranslations of Literary and Cultural Theories, *Target* 15(1), 1–36.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem (2006). *Theories on the Move*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Rodopi.
- Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wikipedia. <http://www.wikipedia.org>. N. p., n.d.
- Yahoo! Search. <http://www.yahoo.de>. N. p., n.d.